

REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action of May 1, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

2. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 23-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 23 has been rewritten to recite a "tangible computer readable storage medium" so that it is clear the claims are directed to a tangible medium. Further, independent claim 23 recites the act of denying access to an Internet site which is a concrete, useful, and tangible result. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

3. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Hastings* (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,629 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed subject matter must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). In the present case, not every feature of the claimed subject matter is represented in the *Hastings* reference.

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A system for controlling computer access, the system comprising:
at least one user profile for at least one respective user, each user profile indicating access times that the respective user is authorized to access a computer, including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer, wherein each user profile is customizable for the respective user; and
a control unit to regulate user-access to the computer according to the user profile of a current user of the computer.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Hastings* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “at least one user profile for at least one respective user, each user profile indicating access times that the respective user is authorized to access a computer, including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer, wherein each user profile is customizable for the respective user,” as recited and emphasized above in claim 1.

Rather, *Hastings* describes a system where a producer of information associates date/time intervals and geographic regions with items of information such that an item is only accessible during a particular date/time interval for a particular geographic region where a user resides. See col. 4, lines 27-41. *Hastings* fails to teach or suggest an access time used to control time to a local computer application of a computer, as described in claim 1. Rather, *Hastings* describes controlling access to a computer file on a network. As such, *Hastings* does not teach or suggest “at least one user profile for at least one respective user, each user profile indicating access times that the respective user is authorized to access a computer, including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer, wherein each user profile is customizable for the respective user,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, *Hastings* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-3, 6-7, and 9

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 2-3, 6-7, and 9 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 2-3, 6-7, and 9 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

4. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 4-5, 8, 10-11, and 12-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Hastings* in view of *Schmidt* (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,807).

a. Claims 4-5, 8, and 10-11

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 4-5, 8, and 10-11 depend from claim 7, recite additional features, and *Schmidt* fails to remedy the deficiencies of the *Hastings* reference, claims 4-5, 8, and 10-11 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

b. Claim 12

As provided in independent claim 12, Applicants claim:

A method to control computer access, comprising:
creating at least one user profile restricting computer access according to time restrictions for at least one respective user including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer;

storing the at least one user profile on a computer;
identifying a current user of the computer;
receiving a request from the current user for computer access;
checking the user profile of the current user to determine if the current user is authorized for the computer access at a current time; and
denying access to the Internet site if the current user is not authorized for computer access at the current time.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 12 is allowable for at least the reason that *Hastings* in view of *Schmidt* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “creating at least one user profile restricting computer access according to time

restrictions for at least one respective user including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer” and “denying access to the Internet site if the current user is not authorized for computer access at the current time,” as recited and emphasized above in claim 12.

For example, *Hastings* describes a system where a producer of information associates date/time intervals and geographic regions with items of information such that an item is only accessible during a particular date/time interval for a particular geographic region where a user resides. See col. 4, lines 27-41. *Hastings* fails to teach or suggest an access time used to control time to a local computer application of a computer, as described in claim 12. Rather, *Hastings* describes controlling access to a computer file on a network. As such, *Hastings* does not teach or suggest “creating at least one user profile restricting computer access according to time restrictions for at least one respective user including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer” and “denying access to the Internet site if the current user is not authorized for computer access at the current time,” as recited in claim 12.

Further, *Schmidt* describes a method of managing access to a distributive network, such as the Internet. As such, *Schmidt* fails to teach or suggest time restrictions for accessing a local computer application of a computer, as described in claim 12. Rather, *Schmidt* describes controlling access to network sites. As such, *Schmidt* does not teach or suggest “creating at least one user profile restricting computer access according to time restrictions for at least one respective user including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer” and “denying access to the Internet site if the current user is not authorized for computer access at the current time,” as recited in claim 12.

For at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the proposed combination of *Hastings* in view of *Schmidt*, and the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

c. Claims 13-22

For at least the reasons given above, claim 12 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 13-22 depend from claim 12 and recite additional features, claims 13-22 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

d. Claim 23

As provided in independent claim 23, Applicants claim:

A tangible computer-readable storage medium for storing a program that when executed on a computer controls computer access, the program comprising:

creating at least one user profile restricting computer access according to time restrictions for at least one respective user including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer;

storing the at least one user profile on the computer;

identifying a current user of the computer;

receiving a request from the current user for computer access;

checking the user profile of the current user to determine if the current user is authorized for the computer access at a current time; and

denying access to the Internet site if the current user is not authorized for computer access at the current time.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 23 is allowable for at least the reason that *Hastings* in view of *Schmidt* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “creating at least one user profile restricting computer access according to time restrictions for at least one respective user including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer” and “denying access to the Internet site if the current user is not authorized for computer access at the current time,” as recited and emphasized above in claim 23.

For example, *Hastings* describes a system where a producer of information associates date/time intervals and geographic regions with items of information such that an item is only accessible during a particular date/time interval for a particular geographic region where a user resides. See col. 4, lines 27-41. *Hastings* fails to teach or suggest an access time used to control time to a local computer application of a

computer, as described in claim 23. Rather, *Hastings* describes controlling access to a computer file on a network. As such, *Hastings* does not teach or suggest “creating at least one user profile restricting computer access according to time restrictions for at least one respective user including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer” and “denying access to the Internet site if the current user is not authorized for computer access at the current time,” as recited in claim 23.

Further, *Schmidt* describes a method of managing access to a distributive network, such as the Internet. As such, *Schmidt* fails to teach or suggest time restrictions for accessing a local computer application of a computer, as described in claim 23. Rather, *Schmidt* describes controlling access to network sites. As such, *Schmidt* does not teach or suggest “creating at least one user profile restricting computer access according to time restrictions for at least one respective user including a time for accessing a particular local computer application of the computer” and “denying access to the Internet site if the current user is not authorized for computer access at the current time,” as recited in claim 23.

For at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the proposed combination of *Hastings* in view of *Schmidt*, and the rejection of claim 23 should be withdrawn.

e. Claims 24-32

For at least the reasons given above, claim 23 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 24-32 depend from claim 23 and recite additional features, claims 24-32 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Applicants reserve the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Applicants. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500